

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/725,034	MATSUMOTO, NAOYUKI	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Gautam Sain	2176	

**All Participants:**

(1) Gautam Sain.

(2) Edward Kmett.
**Status of Application:** \_\_\_\_

(3) \_\_\_\_

(4) \_\_\_\_

**Date of Interview:** 7 April 2005
**Time:** \_\_\_\_

**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

**Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:** ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:


Claims discussed:

11, 17

Prior art documents discussed:

**Part II.**
**SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:**
*See Continuation Sheet*
**Part III.**

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.



**SANJIV SHAH**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**

GS  
(Examiner/SPE Signature)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner noticed a potential typographical error that claim 17 depended on claim 16 (cancelled claim) and requested clarification that claim 17 should depend on claim 11. Applicant (via voice mail message 3/7/05, 5:45 pm EST) confirmed the error and approved an examiner's amendment to correct the dependency for claim 17 to depend on claim 11. .